

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE****Patent and Trademark Office**Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

SERIAL NUMBER	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
10/115,521	10/01/95	LEWIS FG	1 29187 10001

ROQUELY CEDARWOOD CASTRO
HUNDESON & TATUM
51450 ALTO SQUARE
4TH FLOOR
PALO ALTO, CA 94301

2001/1010

EXAMINER
DTNII, D

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2512
DATE MAILED:

10/10/95

~~20~~ DC
22 pms

This is a communication from the examiner in charge of your application.
COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS

This application has been examined Responsive to communication filed on 9-17-95 This action is made final.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s), 0 days from the date of this letter.
Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. 35 U.S.C. 133

Part I THE FOLLOWING ATTACHMENT(S) ARE PART OF THIS ACTION:

1. Notice of References Cited by Examiner, PTO-892.
2. Notice of Draftsman's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.
3. Notice of Art Cited by Applicant, PTO-1449. (7)
4. Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152.
5. Information on How to Effect Drawing Changes, PTO-1474.
6.

Part II SUMMARY OF ACTION

1. Claims 1 - 206 are pending in the application.

Of the above, claims 57, 62-65, 187-193, 195, 197-199, 202-206 are withdrawn from consideration.

2. Claims 1 - 54, 65, 70, 72-186 have been cancelled.

3. Claims _____ are allowed.

4. Claims 55, 58-61, 66-67, 71, 194, 196, 200-201 are rejected.

5. Claims _____ are objected to.

6. Claims _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

7. This application has been filed with informal drawings under 37 C.F.R. 1.85 which are acceptable for examination purposes.

8. Formal drawings are required in response to this Office action.

9. The corrected or substitute drawings have been received on _____. Under 37 C.F.R. 1.84 these drawings are acceptable; not acceptable (see explanation or Notice of Draftsman's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948).

10. The proposed additional or substitute sheet(s) of drawings, filed on _____, has (have) been approved by the examiner; disapproved by the examiner (see explanation).

11. The proposed drawing correction, filed _____, has been approved; disapproved (see explanation).

12. Acknowledgement is made of the claim for priority under 35 U.S.C. 119. The certified copy has been received not been received been filed in parent application, serial no. _____; filed on _____.

13. Since this application appears to be in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

14. Other

Interview Summary

EXAMINER'S ACTION

Part III DETAILED ACTION

Claims 57, 62-65, 187-193, 195 197-199, 202-206 are withdrawn from further consideration by the examiner, 37 C.F.R. § 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected species. Election was made **without** traverse in telephonic interview on 09/30/96 with Applicant's representative Criag Opperman.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 C.F.R. § 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. M.P.E.P. § 809.02(a).

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103 of the other invention.

Claims 55, 58-61, 66-67, 71, 194, 196, 200-201 are present for examination.

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. § 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section

371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

Claims 55, 58-61, 66-67, 71, 194, 196, 200-201 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by the Champa US patent 5,315,633.

As per claim 55, Champa teaches a teleconferencing system essentially as claimed having a first network for data [fig.4 #53], comprising:

an AV path [fig.4 # 45] for carrying AV signals, connecting the first workstation [fig.4] to a second work station [another station as in fig.4] via a third location [control hub fig.5, see col.7 lines 34-40];

first, second codecs [fig.4 #41], and third codecs [fig.5 #76] at said first, second and third locations configured to compress AV signal;

an AV switch [fig.5 switch #57] at the third location operable to route compressed AV signals to other locations without said compressed AV signals being decompressed by said third codec [apparent from col.6 and fig.5 - from fig.5, it is clear that the third codec (76) only code/decode signal for the link 75. All other signal would pass through the switch untouched by the codec 76].

As per claims 58-61, Champa teaches using dedicated line [fig.5 #77, col.7 line4-9], and dial up link [col.7 lines 10-33, "lease line"] connecting first and second stations to the third station.

As per claim 66-67, Champa teaches signal router [fig.5 switch #57]. It is apparent that the switch route the signal base on the actual state of the AV paths.

As per claim 71, Champa teaches trunk line and associated codec [fig.5 line 75 and codec #76].

As per claim 194, since each station [fig.4] is a separate conference site, it is apparent that they have physically separate path.

As per claim 196, it is rejected under similar rationale as for claim 55 above.

As per claim 200-201, they are rejected under similar rationale as for claim 66-67 above.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Crawford et al. "VIDEOMATIC SWITCHING: SYSTEM AND SERVICES" disclose a teleconferencing network using digital/analog hybrid similar to the present invention.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dung Dinh whose telephone number is (703) 305-9655. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 7:00 AM - 4:30 PM. The examiner can also be reached on alternate Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thomas Lee can be reached at (703) 305-9717. The fax phone number for this group is (703) 308-5359.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-9600.


D Dinh
Patent Examiner
Sept. 30, 1996